

MS Issue Fee
PATENT
1163-0500PUS1

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Tatsuya MITSUGI	Conf.:	1861
Appl. No.:	10/806,092	Group:	2176
Filed:	March 23, 2004	Examiner:	C. T. Nguyen
For:	DOCUMENT INFORMATION PROCESSING APPARATUS		

MS Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

July 6, 2007

Sir:

The comments attached herewith do not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process and therefore cannot be considered a "failure to engage in reasonable efforts" to conclude processing or examination of the application. Accordingly, the submission of said comments must not result in a reduction of the patent term adjustment of 385 days pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(c)(10). See O.G. 26 June 2001, lines 38-53.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT FOR REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

In response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance included in the Notice of Allowance dated May 22, 2007, the reasons for allowance have been noted and the following comments are respectfully submitted in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-21 remain pending and stand allowed in the application. In the Statement of Reasons for Allowance, the Examiner indicates that:

“Claim 1 is allowed because the prior art of record does not expressly disclose alone or in combination an element refinement processing unit for automatically adding content to the structure document in association with at least one meaningful words in order to generate a markup document, wherein the added content is different from the markup tags in the markup document, and *the added content includes at least one of data which is related to at least one of the meaningful words and which is read from the data storage unit, is generated according to a determined attribute of the at least one of the meaningful words.*” (Paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4; emphasis added)

Initially, while Applicants agree that each of the pending claims define over the prior art of record, Applicants wish to emphasize that it is each claim, taken as a whole, which defines the claimed invention. Furthermore, in the emphasized portion of above-quoted paragraph, the Examiner’s statement misstates certain limitations in claim 1, presumably due to a typographical error. The actual language of claim 1, with respect to these limitations, is:

“wherein...the added content includes at least one of:

data, which is related to at least one of the meaningful words and which is read from the data storage unit, and

data, which is related to at least one of the meaningful words and which is generated according to a determined attribute of the at least one of the meaningful words.”

Accordingly, in view of the different language recited in independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s statement should not in any way unduly limit the scope of claim 1. Instead, claim 1 should be interpreted in light of the actual language contained therein.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
for Michael K. Mutter, #29,680
417,305
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MKM/JWR/cln
1163-0500PUS1